

The 27th May, 1982

No. 9(1)82-6Lab/4126.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Krishan Lal-Ashok Kumar, Rajan Street, Old Sabji Mandi, Jagadhari :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 133 of 1980 (Fbd. 356/1981)

*between*

SHRI BANARSI DASS WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT MANAGEMENT OF M/S KRISHAN LAL-ASHOK KUMAR, RAJAN STREET, OLD SABJI MANDI, JAGADHARI

Shri Surinder Kumar for the workman.

Shri Subhash Chand for the management.

AWARD

This reference No. 133 of 1980 has been referred to the Labour Court, Rohtak by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. ID/YMN/111-80/30735, dated 20th June, 1980 under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Banarsi Dass workman and the management of M/s. Krishan Lal-Ashok Kumar, Rajan Street, Old Sabji Mandi, Jagadhari. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Banarsi Dass was justified and in order? If not, what to relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference, notices were sent to the parties by the Labour Court, Rohtak. The parties appeared. Eight adjournments were given to the respondent for filing of the written statement. Then the Haryana Government transferred this case to this Court,—*vide* order No. I (79) 80-1 Lab, dated 20th October, 1981. And this case was received in this Court in December, 1981 in reference No. 356 of 1981.

After receiving this case file, notices were sent to the parties. The parties appeared and the case was fixed for written statement on the request of the management subject to the costs of Rs. 50/- for 23rd February, 1982 at Panipat. On 23rd February, 1982 none was present on behalf of the parties. It was already 2.30 P.M. The case called thrice. In these circumstances, I feel that the workman is not interested to pursue his case. So I hold that the reference is bad in law and the case is dismissed in default. No orders as to costs.

Dated, the 9th April, 1982.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 832, dated the 19th April, 1982

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, with the request that the receipt of the above-said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

HARI SINGH, KAUSHIK,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 9(1)82-6Lab/4127.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Pemco Industries, 21, Industrial Area, Yamuna Nagar :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

References Nos. 127, 131 and 132 of 1979 (Fbd. 335, 334 and 332/1981)

*between*

S/SHRI DAVINDER SINGH, VIJAY KUMAR AND RANJIT SINGH, WORKMEN AND THE RESPONDENT MANAGEMENT OF M/S PEMCO INDUSTRIES, 21, INDUSTRIAL AREA, YAMUNA NAGAR

Shri Inder Singh and Sukh Nandan Singh for the workmen.

Shri Subhash Chand for the management.

## AWARD

These references Nos. 127, 131 and 132 of 1979 have been referred to the Labour Court, Rohtak, by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his orders Nos. YMN/54-79/27070, 51-79/27106 and 50-79/27112, dated 26th June, 1979, under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the disputes existing between S/Shri Davinder Singh, Vijay Kumar and Ranjit Singh, workmen and the respondent-management of M/s Pemco Industries, 21, Industrial Area, Yamuna Nagar. The terms of the references were :—

Whether the termination of services of S/Shri Davinder Singh, Vijay Kumar and Ranjit Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief are they entitled ?

After receiving these references, notices were sent to the parties by the Labour Court, Rohtak. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, issues were framed on 26th February, 1980. And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. Twelve adjournments, were given for this purpose. Then the Haryana Government transferred these cases to this Court,—*vide* order No. I(79)-80-1Lab, dated 20th October, 1981. And these cases were received in this Court in December, 1981 in references Nos. Fbd. 335, 334 and 332 of 1981.

After receiving these case files, notices were sent to the parties. The parties appeared. On 8th April, 1982 these three references were consolidated on the request of the parties, representative because of the same nature, facts of law and against the same management and ordered that the evidence will be recorded in Reference No. 127 of 1979 (Fbd. 335 of 1981) of Shri Davinder Singh workman's case. On the same day, the representative of the management made a statement in this Court that the management has agreed to pay a sum of Rs 200, Rs 400 and 400 to the workmen respectively in full and final settlement of their all claims or dispute including the right of reinstatement or re-employment to the workman. He further stated that the above-said payment will be made to the workmen within week. He also stated that after receiving this payment there is no dispute between the parties. This statement was duly admitted by the representative of the workmen.

In the light of the above statement of the parties, I hold that the workmen had settled their cases with the management mutually and after receiving the payment of Rs 200, 400 and 400 to the workmen Sarvshri Davinder Singh, Vijay Kumar and Ranjiit Singh in full and final settlement of their all claims or dispute including the right of reinstatement or re-employment, there will be no dispute between the parties. I give my award accordingly. No orders as to costs.

Dated, the 9th April, 1982.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 833, dated the 19th April, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, with the request that the receipt of the above-said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)82-6Lab/4138.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Haryana Packing Industries, C-155, Sector 11, Faridabad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 37 of 1982

*between*

SHRI HANAN MALIK, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT-MANAGEMENT OF M/S  
HARYANA PACKING INDUSTRIES, C/155, SECTOR-11, FARIDABAD

None for the workman.

Shri Sham Singh for the respondent-management.

## AWARD

This reference No. 37 of 1982 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. 1D/FD/11/82/7832, dated the 23rd February, 1982, existing between Shri Hanan, workman and the management of M/s. Haryana Packing Industries, C/155, Sector-11, Faridabad. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Hanan Malik was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receiving the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties, for 25th March, 1982. On that day none was present from the side of the workman. Shri Sham Singh was present from the side of the management. Service of notice has been effected on the workman. I waited upto 2-00 P.M. and proceeded *ex parte* against the workman and fixed the case for recording of *ex parte* evidence of the management for 5th April, 1982.

Shri Sham Singh, partner appeared as MW-1, who has stated that their factory started its functioning from 1979 and from the very beginning 8 or 9 workers are usually working in the factory but there is no worker named as Hanan Malik in the factory. When the claimant is not workman of the factory so his termination of service does not arise and the reference is bad in law.

In view of the unrebutted *ex parte* statement of the respondent, I am left with no choice except to believe the version of the management. This my findings gets supports from the absenting of the workman in the proceedings. I feel that there is no relation of employer and employee between the parties. So I hold that the reference is bad in law.

This be read in answer to this reference.

Dated, the 15th April, 1982.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 844, dated the 19th April, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)82-6Lab/4140.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s New India Dying and Finishing Mills, 14/5, Mathura Road, Faridabad:—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 215 of 1981

*between*

SHRI LAXMAN KANT, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT OF M/S NEW INDIA DYING AND FINISHING MILLS, 14/5, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Shri Darshan Singh for the workman.

Shri G. S. Ghaudhry for the management.

## AWARD

This reference No. 215 of 1981 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/127-81/35823, dated 30th July, 1981, under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, existing between Shri Laxman Kant, workman and the management of M/s New India Dying and Finishing Mills, 14/5, Mathura Road, Faridabad. The terms of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Laxman Kant, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed:—

1. Whether the termination of services of the workman is proper justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?
2. Relief?

After framing the issues the case was fixed for recording of evidence of the management. The evidence of the management was recorded as MW-1 and closed their case. Then the case was fixed for evidence of the workman, but after taking three adjournments the evidence of the workman was not present and the representative of the workman made a statement that he has informed the workman two and three times about his case. Now he has no instructions to pursue his case, so he closed his evidence.

In view of the statement of the representative of the workman, I feel that the workman is not interested in this case. So I hold that there is no dispute between the parties.

This be read in answer to this reference.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Dated the 16th April, 1982.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 846, dated 19th April, 1982

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)82-6Lab./4269.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Sartaj Rubber and Plastic Industries, N.I.T., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 166/1981

between

SHRI HARI RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SARTAJ RUBBER AND PLASTIC INDUSTRIES, N.I.T., FARIDABAD

Present:—

Shri Balbir Singh, for the workman.

Shri K. P. Aggarwal for the management.

## AWARD

The State Government of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Hari Ram and the management of M/s. Sartaj Rubber and Plastic Industries, N.I.T., Faridabad, by order No. ID/FD/58-81/28430, dated the 5th June 1981, to this Tribunal, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Hari Ram was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Notices were issued to the parties who appeared, and filed their pleading. On the pleading, the following issues were framed by me vide— my order 16th October, 1981:—

1. Whether the workman has resigned the job? If so, to that effect?
2. Whether the termination of services of the workman was justified and in order? If so, to what relief is he entitled?

Management examined Shri K. N. Kohli, manager as MW-1 and closed its evidence. The workman was called upon lead to his evidence but he finally settled his dispute with the management on receipt of Rs 465 and tendering his resignation.

In view of the above, I give may award that the workman has settled his dispute with the management and he was not entitled for further relief.

Dated the 21st April, 1982.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 410, dated the 22nd April, 1982

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M.C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 9(1)82-6Lab./4271.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Chanda Enterprises Fabricators and Engineers, Mujesar, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 259/1981

*between*

WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S CHANDA ENTERPRISES  
FABRICATORS AND ENGINEERS, MUJESAR, FARIDABAD

Present:—

Shri Najesh Singh, for the workman.

Shri K. P. Aggarwal, for the management.

## AWARD

The State Government of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Chanda Enterprises Fabricators and Engineers, Mujesar, Faridabad and its workman, by order No. ID/FD/77/81/37475, dated 13th August, 1981, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

1. Whether the existing grades and scales of pay need revision? If so, with what details?

2. Whether the workman are entitled to grant of bonus at the rate of 20% for the years 1977-78, 1978-79 & 1979-80 ? If so, with what details ?

Notices were issued to parties who appeared. The workman were afforded many opportunities to file claim statement but they did not file any. The management filed its written statement in which the objection was taken that the name of the management was not given correctly. The workman took many opportunities to get the same amended but they could not do so even after a time gap of three months.

The reference was in the name of M/s Chanda Enterprises Fabricators and Engineers, Mujesar, Faridabad whereas the name of undertaking was M/s Chanda Enterprises, Mujesar only. So this reference is bad and dismissed.

Dated, the 15th April, 1982.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

Endst. No. 397, dated the 22nd April, 1982

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 9(1)-82-6Lab/4272.— In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Pratibha Ceramics Private Limited, Sector-24, Faridabad:—

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 171/1979

between

SHRI RAMESHWAR PARSHAD, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S PRATIBHA CERAMICS PRIVATE LIMITED, SECTOR-24, FARIDABAD.

Present :—

Shri Sager Ram, Gupta for the workman.

Shri K. P. Aggarwal, for the management.

#### AWARD

The State Government of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Rameshwari Parshad and the management of M/s Partibha Ceramics Private Limited, Sector-24, Faridabad, by order No. ID/1039-G-77/22262, dated 22nd May, 1979, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Rameshwari Parshad was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

Notices were issued to the parties who appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings, the following issues were framed by my learned predecessor,—vide order dated 1st January, 1980 :—

- (1) Whether the termination of services of the workman is justified and in order ?
- (2) Relief.

The case was fixed for the evidence of the management who examined Dr. Pran Nath, Certifying Surgeon, Haryana as MW-8 and Shri Balraj Singh Tyagi, time keeper of the respondent management as MW-2. The workman was afforded many opportunity for this evidence but he did not lead any. Arguments were heard.

Issues No. 1.

MW-1 desposed that he inspected the factory of the management on 6th August, 1975 under Section 87 read with schedule 15, Rule 102 of Factories Act. He had examined seventeen workers out of whom 5 workers including the concerned workman were found unfit. He had found the concerned workman with poor physique, under-weight and suffering from Chronic Bronchitis. In the X-rays examination, the same disease was found. His report Ex. M-1. MW-23 is stated that Dr. Pran Nath, Certifying Surgeon, Government of Haryana inspected the factory and his report was Ex. M-1. The concerned workman was found unfit. The workman was given full account of Rs 3112.76, *idem* voucher Ex. M-3, but he did not receive the amount. He was also given the retrenchment benefit. The management also wrote a letter Ex. M-5 to E. S. I. Dispensary about inspection. In cross examination, he replied that the concerned workman used to remain on leave frequently. In the argument, the learned representative of the management argued that there was no malice of the management against the workman. He was relieved of his services on the report of Certifying Surgeon, Haryana which was binding on the management, so-much-so that the management could be prosecuted in case such a workman was still kept on the job. He cited F. J. R., Volume 49, page 150 and urged that Chronic Bronchitis was such a disease that a workman suffering from it, could not be kept on the job which was performed by the concerned workman. On the other, the Learned representative of the workman argued that the action of the management was wrong in so-far-as it did not provide the workman alternative job. He further urged that the management did not try to get the workman treated from E. S. I. Dispensary so that he could have recovered from illness but he could not cite any rule or law which enjoined upon the management to follow such procedure. In the circumstances, I do not find any thing against the action of the management.

While answering the reference, I give my award that the respondent management has rightly terminated the services of Shri Rameshwar Parshad on the above grounds and he is not entitled to any relief. I order accordingly.

Dated the 15th April, 1982.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 399, dated the 22nd April, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

The 10th June, 1982

No. 9(1)82-6Lab/5058.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Saraswati Ceramics Refractories, Sector-25, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 146 1979

between

SARVSHRI MAHESH PARSSAD, ANRUDH, KAPIL DEV, BIRAN, SUBHASH KUMAR, SHIV BALAK, JIT SINGH YADAV, AND SHRI BRAHAMA AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. SARASWATI CERAMICS REFRactories, SECTOR-25, FARIDABAD.

Present.—

Shri D. D. Aggarwal, for the management.

Nemo for the workmen.

## AWARD

The State Government of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workmen Shri Vshri Mahesh Parsahad, Anrudh, Kapil Dev, Biran Subhash Kumar, Shiv Balak, Jit Singh Yadav and Shri Brahma and the management of M/s Saraswati Ceramics Refractories, Sector 25, Faridabad, by order No. ID/FD/15-79/18258 dated 3rd May, 1979, to this Tribunal, for adjudication in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of workmen Sarvshri Mahesh Parsahad, Anrudh, Kapil Dev, Biran, Subash Kumar, Shiv Balak, Jit Singh Yadav and Brahma were justified and in order? If not, to what relief they are entitled?

Notices were sent to the parties who appeared and filed their pleadings. Issue under reference was put for trial by order, dated 29th August, 1980. The case was fixed for the evidence of the management. The management placed on record receipts Ex. M-1 to M-7 by which the workmen had settled their dispute. The workmen made a statement that they admit their signatures on the receipts but deny the payment. In this circumstance, the workmen were called upon to lead their evidence in rebuttal of the claim of the management. On the date fixed, none of the workmen or their representative appeared. Therefore, statement of Shri D.D. Aggarwal, representative of the management was recorded who stated that the workmen had settled their dispute with the management and there remained nothing for adjudication.

Believing the evidence of the representative of the management and considering non-participation of the workmen in proceeding, I presume that the dispute had been settled by the parties and there nothing remain for adjudication.

Dated the 5th May, 1982.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 486, dated 11th May, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No 9(1)82-6Lab/5060.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Belmont Rubber Industries 58-B, Industrial Area, Faridabad:—

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 213 of 1981

between

SHRI RAM CHET YADAV, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BELMOUNT  
RUBBER INDUSTRIES, 58-B, INDUSTRIAL AREA, FARIDABAD

Present—

Shri Nagesh Singh, for the workman.

Shri Satish Ahuja, for the management.

## AWARD

The State Government of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Ram Chet Yadav and the management of M/s Belmont Rubber Industries, 58-B, Industrial Area, Faridabad by order No. ID/FD/81/81/32099, dated 3rd July, 1981, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Chet Yadav was justified and in order? If so, to what relief is he entitled?

Notices of the reference, were sent to the parties who appeared and filed their pleadings. The issue under reference was put for trial by order, dated the 21st September, 1981. The management examined Shri Mohinder Luthra as MW-1 and the workman examined himself as his own witness. At the time of argument, parties made a statement that the dispute had been mutually settled. The representative for the workman endorsed the settlement. In view of the above, I made my award that the workman had settled his dispute and there remains nothing for adjudication.

Dated the 11th May, 1982.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 484, dated the 11th May, 1982

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)82-6-Lab/5263.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Century Engineering Company Plot No. 183 Sector-24, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 73/1982

*between*

SHRI NANDU WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S CENTURN ENGINEERING  
COMPANY PLOT NO. 183, SECTOR-24, FARIDABAD.

Present:

Shri Nandu workman.  
Shri R. S. Arora for the management.

#### AWARD

The State Government of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Nandu and the management of M/s. Century Engineering Company Plot No. 183, Sector-24, Faridabad by order No. ID/FD/13/82/9932, dated 9th March, 1982, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of Services of Shri Nandu was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Notices of the reference were sent to the parties who appeared. On the date fixed, the workman made a statement that he had got employment in a other factory and he did not want adjudication for his case.

In view of the above, I make my award that their is not dispute between the parties.

Dated 15th May, 1982.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 513, dated 21st May, 1982

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.